

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-24 are currently pending in this application. Independent claims 1, 3, 5, 13, and 22-24 have been amended to stress the feature of the present invention disclosing forward channel transmission timeslots as being out of phase from reverse channel transmission time slots by less than one time slot interval. The Applicant submits that no new matter has been introduced into the application by these amendments.

**Claim Rejections**

Claims 1-5, 7-9, 13, 15-18, and 22-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Reese (U.S. Patent No. 6,226,274). Claims 6, 11, 14, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Reese. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent claims 1, 3, 5, 13, and 22-24 are not anticipated by Reese because Reese does not teach or suggest forward channel time slots and reverse channel time slots wherein reverse channel time slots are out of phase with forward channel time slots **by less than one time slot interval**. Reese discloses a frame structure by which a plurality of user stations are capable of communicating with a base station over two frequency bands so as to perform frequency division duplex (FDD) communication (Col. 3 lines 16-19). As illustrated in Fig. 3, and described in Col. 2, lines 7-31, Reese teaches a prior art GSM frame structure wherein forward (i.e. base station to mobile station) transmission time frames 302 and reverse (i.e. mobile station to base station) transmission time frames 303 are made up of multiple time slots, 306 and 307, respectively, for example 8 timeslots per transmission time frame. With respect to Fig. 3, Reese discloses the forward and reverse transmission time frames as being offset by a predetermined duration, for

**Applicant:** James A. Proctor Jr.  
**Application No.:** 09/691,874

example 3 time slots, for the purpose of providing sufficient processing time, as described in Col. 2, lines 25-31:

**The mobile transmission time frame 303 is "offset" by a predefined duration 305 (e.g., three time slots) from the base transmission time frame 302, so as to allow the mobile stations a sufficient "turn-around" switching time and information processing time, and also to allow propagation of the base-to-mobile messages to the mobile stations.**

Reese teaches a time frame offset consisting of multiple time slots. Because Reese's motivation for providing an offset between forward and reverse time frames is to provide sufficient time for information processing, it would be counterintuitive to conclude from Reese that an offset between time frames that is less than 1 time slot interval, because it would provide less time for processing than if no offset were introduced. Nowhere in Reese is it taught or suggested a time offset between forward and reverse timeslots that is less than one time slot interval.

Claim 1 of the present invention defines a method for staggering channels in a wireless communications unit comprising a first plurality of channels scheduled for a first predetermined cycle, a second plurality of channels scheduled for a second predetermined cycle, wherein each channel in the first and second plurality of channels is dedicated for communication between a wireless communications unit and a single remote wireless communications unit at a predetermined time slot interval and, wherein the second predetermined cycle is out of phase with the first predetermined cycle by less than one time slot interval.

Reese simply does not teach or suggest the staggering of forward and reverse channel allocation cycles by less than one time slot duration resulting in overlapping time slots.

In the present invention, forward and reverse channel allocation cycles are staggered, or offset, by less than one time slot interval so that return messages that are processed in less than a time slot interval may be transmitted sooner, and accordingly free up the channel sooner for other transmissions, as explained on Page 7, lines 17-23. The time slot staggering of the present invention results in overlapping timeslots between forward and reverse communication channels, as illustrated in Fig. 3. Without time slot staggering according to the present invention, return messages must wait at least an entire time slot before being transmitted to a communication station.

Accordingly, Reese does not teach or suggest a first plurality of channels and a second plurality of channels with associated predetermined cycles wherein the predetermined cycles are out of phased by less than one time slot interval as defined by independent claims 1, 3, 5, 13, and 22-24. The remaining claims 2, 4, 6-12, and 14-21 are dependent upon claims 1, 3, 5, and 13, respectively, and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons provided above.

Based on the arguments presented above, the withdrawal of rejections of claims 1-24 is respectfully requested.

**Applicant:** James A. Proctor Jr.  
**Application No.:** 09/691,874

**Conclusion**

If the Examiner believes that any additional minor formal matters need to be addressed in order to place this application in condition for allowance, or that a telephone interview will help to materially advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone at the Examiner's convenience.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application, including claims 1-24, is in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Proctor Jr.

By Scott Wolinsky  
Scott Wolinsky  
Registration No. 46,413

Volpe and Koenig, P.C.  
United Plaza, Suite 1600  
30 South 17th Street  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
Telephone: (215) 568-6400  
Facsimile: (215) 568-6499

SW/CRT/klw